

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 3-9 are amended, and claim 2 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 9. Claim 9 is not rewritten in independent form at this time because its base claim is believed to be allowable as discussed in detail below.

The Office Action rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. To obviate the rejection, claim 1 is amended to incorporate the features of canceled claim 2. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-9 are amended to correct dependency and increase clarity. Therefore, these amendments do not change the scope of these claims and are non-narrowing. Accordingly, the patentability of these claims is not affected by the amendments.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 2,709,567 to Wood. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, claim 2 is canceled, and the features of claim 2 are incorporated in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 recites that an air cooled bearing is comprised of means for imparting a swirl component to cooling air flowing towards the bearing, and that the means for imparting a swirl component comprises at least one vane.

The Office Action alleges that a slinger disc 32 corresponds to the recited means for imparting a swirl component. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the slinger disc 32 operates in annular chamber 42 and is isolated from the cooling air. As described at col. 4, lines 19-29, Wood teaches that when the device of wood is in operation, the fan elements formed by the slinger members 26,

32 produce flow of air and fine oil mist outwardly through the bearings 18 and 21. However, Wood specifically teaches at col. 4, lines 69-74 that the cold air in the passages 110 cools the metal wall of the bearing support 14, and cools the bearing via the metal wall of the bearing support. Furthermore, the slinger discs would not impart swirl to the secondary flow as the air is pulled through the bearing, rather than pushed through it.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied art.

Claims 4, 5, 8 and 10 are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for the additional features they recite. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,886,985 to Kostrzewsky et al. (Kostrzewsky). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant first notes that Kostrzewsky is qualified as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) not (b) as Applicant's application was filed prior to the issue date of Kostrzewsky.

As described above, claim 2 is canceled by this Amendment, and the features of claim 2 are incorporated into claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 recites that an air cooled bearing is comprised of means for imparting a swirl component to cooling air flowing towards the bearing, and that the means for imparting a swirl component comprises at least one vane.

The Office Action alleges that an inboard side 32 corresponds to the recited means for imparting a swirl component. However, Kostrzewsky does not teach or suggest such means for imparting a swirl component, but rather teaches the use of cooling fans 54 to cool the external housing of a bearing, as described at col. 4, lines 58-65. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentably distinct from the applied art.

Claim 3 is allowable at least for its dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Kostrzewsky in view of Wood. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, neither Kostrzewsky nor Wood teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable at least for its dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features it recites. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wood in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,860,639 to Tabuchi et al. (Tabuchi). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Tabuchi does not overcome the deficiency of Wood with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 7 and 8 are allowable at least for its dependence on claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1 and 3-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff

Registration No. 27,075

Robert A. Miller

Registration No. 32,771

JAO:KXH/tbh

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: December 9, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--